REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated August 25, 2010 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-16 and 18-32 are pending in the subject application. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to claim 30 set forth herein above. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the present Application is respectfully requested in view of the above proposed amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-16 and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as ostensibly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended independent claim 30 herein to recite computer-readable storage media. Independent claims 1, 31, and 32, as previously presented, recite a computer-readable storage medium. Thus, each of independent claims 1, 30, 31, and 32 are Beauregard (computer-readable media) claims, which have been and are proper claims, a point illustrated in a recent final decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences that expressly approved of Beauregard claims. See *Ex parte Bo Li*, Appeal 2008-1213 (BPAI 2008). Further, MPEP § 2106.01 I. states that "[w]hen a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, USPTO personnel should treat the claim as a product claim."

Further, each of independent claims 1, 30, and 31 recites one or more computing devices or other structures within the body of the claims thereby, further tying the claims to a machine or apparatus. Additionally, although independent claims 1 and 30 recite features of a system, the claims are directed to a computer-readable media. And although claims 31 and 32 recite features of a data packet and a data structure, respectively, these claims also are directed to computer-readable media having a data packet or data structure stored thereon.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 30, 31, and 32 recite statutory subject matter and request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection thereof.

Claims 2-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-16 are also directed to statutory subject matter and request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Reunert in view of Zothner

Claims 1-16 and 18-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,418,426 to Reunert, et al. (hereinafter "Reunert") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,657 to Zothner (hereinafter "Zothner").

Applicants submit that the instant application and Reunert were, at the time the invention of the instant application was made, owned by Microsoft® Corporation. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Reunert is disqualified as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Accordingly, Reunert cannot be relied upon as describing the features recited in the rejected claims.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1, as previously presented, recites computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions embodied thereon that, when executed, provide a system that facilitates access to a plurality of shared software objects by disparate entities. The system includes a platform component that receives a request from a first entity to access a shared software object. The first entity is attempting to convert a subscription from a second type of the second entity to a first type of the first entity. The system also includes a data store that stores security information on classes of objects. The security information is inherited by the objects of the class and includes a security parameter that indicates whether the first key is

permitted to convert a subscription from the second type to the first type. A verification component is also included that employs the security information to verify that the first entity has permission to call an application program interface (API) for the shared software object to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type.

In contrast, Zothner is directed to providing notifications in a distributed object-oriented environment. *Zothner* col. 3, ll. 3-5. Business rule triggers map a set of business processes to sets of business rules that map to trigger conditions. *Id.* at col. 4, ll. 42-55. Notifications are mapped to the business triggers to allow appropriate information to be provided based on business conditions or actions. *Id.*

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Zothner fails to describe all of the features of independent claim 1. Zothner fails to teach or suggest a platform component that receives a request from a first entity that is attempting to convert a subscription or a data store that stores security information on classes of shared software objects that indicates whether a first entity is permitted to convert a subscription. Zothner also fails to teach or suggest a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the first entity has permission to call an application program interface for converting the subscription.

Independent Claim 18

Independent claim 18, as previously presented, recites a method to facilitate security for subscription objects. Security options are stored in a database. At least a portion of the security options are related to an automated billing and provisioning system and include conversion of a subscription from a first type associated with a first tenant to a second type associated with a second tenant. Security options indicate allowability of the second tenant to

convert the subscription type from the first type to the second type. Security options are assigned to a class. Security options are inherited by object members of the class.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Zothner fails to describe all of the features of independent claim 18. Zothner does not describe storing security options related to an automated billing and provisioning system in a database that include at least conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type as recited by independent claim 18.

Independent Claim 30

Independent Claim 30, as proposed to be amended, recites computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions embodied thereon that, when executed, provide a system to facilitate business object security. The system includes an authentication component executing on a computing device having a memory and a processor that authenticates a first entity attempting to access an online billing and service system. The first entity is attempting to convert a subscription from a second type of a second entity to a first type of the first entity. The system also includes an authorization component that authorizes the first entity to convert the subscription from the second type of the second entity to the first type of the first entity upon verifying at least one security parameter. The security parameter is assigned to a class of objects and is inherited by objects of the class by explicitly or implicitly assigning the security parameter to the objects of the class. The security parameter is stored in a database and is accessible via an application program interface that is automatically authorized by analyzing security credentials. The at least one security parameter indicates allowability of the first entity to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type.

Applicants respectfully submit that Zothner fails to teach or suggest an authentication component that authenticates a first entity attempting to convert a subscription or

an authorization component that authorizes the first entity to convert the subscription upon verifying a security parameter as recited by independent claim 30 as proposed to be amended herein.

Independent Claim 31

Independent claim 31, as previously presented, recites a computer readable storage medium that stores a data packet that when transmitted facilitates communications between at least two components of a subscription platform service. The data packet includes an application program interface packet to identify a first partner, a security credential packet to facilitate authorization on the first partner, and a security parameter packet to facilitate access to a subscription platform database.

Applicants respectfully submit that Zothner fails to describe an application programming interface (API) packet to identify a first partner or a security credential packet to facilitate authorization of the first partner, as recited by amended independent claim 31.

Independent Claim 32

Independent Claim 32, as previously presented, recites a computer-readable storage medium having a data structure stored thereon. The data structure includes a security field indicating global security parameters in a subscription platform database. The global security parameters include a security parameter for conversion of a subscription of a subscriber from a first type associated with a first tenant to a second type associated with a second tenant. The security parameter for conversion indicates allowability of the second tenant to convert the subscription from the first type to the second type. The data structure also includes an object field associated with an account in the database and a class field to associate the security field

and the object field. An object in the object field that is associated with the class field inherits the security parameter from the class field

Applicants submit that Zothner fails to describe at least a security field indicating global security parameters that include a security parameter for conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Zothner fails to teach or suggest all of the claim features of independent claims 1, 18, 31, and 32 and independent claim 30 as proposed to be amended. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 18, and 30-32 are patentable over Zothner. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 18 and 30-32. Independent claims 1, 18, and 30-32 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is hereby respectfully requested.

Each of claims 2-16 and 19-29 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 or 18 respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Zothner fails to describe all of the limitations of dependent claims 2-16 and 19-29 for at least the above-cited reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-16 and 19-29 are patentable over Zothner, and request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection thereof.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-16 and 18-32 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-559-2564 or areed@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same.

It is believed that no fee is due. However, if this belief is in error, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112, referencing attorney docket number MFCP.149744.

Respectfully submitted,

/AARON S REED/

Aaron S. Reed
Reg. No. 56,116

TLB/ASR/jc
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO   64108-2613
816-474-6550